

Application No. 10/050,711
Supplemental Amendment After Final Action dated May 21, 2004
Reply to Advisory Action of April 13, 2004

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 and 8-25 were pending in the application.

Claim 1 was the sole independent claim.

Applicant has cancelled Claim 1, incorporating its recitations into Claims 20 and 23, rendering each of these claims independent and allowable as set forth in the Amendment After Final Rejection (page 4).

Applicant has also amended Claims 2-5, 8-11, 16-17 and 19 to make them method claims, depending directly or indirectly from Claim 20, and added new Claims 26-36 which track the language of Claims 2-5, 8-11, 16-17 and 19, respectively, but depending directly or indirectly instead from Claim 23.

As such, upon entry hereof, Claims 1-4, 8-11, 15-17, 19-20 and 22-25 will remain presented herein for re-examination and Claims 26-36 will have been added for examination.

Applicant's Further Response to Section 112, ¶ 2 Rejections

Claim 21 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite, reasons for which are given at page 3 of the final Office Action.

Applicant has cancelled the claim, thereby rendering moot the Section 112 rejection thereof.

Application No. 10/050,711
Supplemental Amendment After Final Action dated May 21, 2004
Reply to Advisory Action of April 13, 2004

Accordingly, Applicant submits the Section 112 rejection should no longer be mentioned.

Applicant's Further Response to Sections 102 and 103 Rejections

Claims 1-5, 11-13, and 15-19 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by or in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Trom. Claim 8 and 9 stand rejected for the first time under Section 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by or in the alternative, under Section 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Trom. Reasons for these rejections are found at pages 3-4 of the Action.

Without agreeing with or conceding the propriety of the instant Sections 102 and 103 rejections, but instead wishing to advance the prosecution on the merits, Applicant's claim amendments introduced herein obviate the remaining Sections 102 and 103 rejections thereof.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the Section 103 rejections are respectfully requested.

Application No. 10/050,711
Supplemental Amendment After Final Action dated May 21, 2004
Reply to Advisory Action of April 13, 2004

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, the present invention is patentably distinct from the documents of record. Accordingly, favorable consideration and reconsideration (as the case may be) and prompt issuance of a notice of allowance are respectfully requested.

The present paper is an earnest attempt at advancing prosecution on the merits, acceptance of which is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. At the very least, entry of this paper reduces issues for appeal. Applicant therefore respectfully requests prompt approval and entry of this Supplemental Amendment After Final Rejection.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached by telephone at (860) 571-5001, by facsimile at (860) 571-5028, or by email at steve.bauman@loctite.com. All correspondence should continue to be directed to the address given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven C. Bauman
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 33,832

HENKEL CORPORATION
Legal Department
1001 Trout Brook Crossing
Rocky Hill, Connecticut 06067

\LCHQMAIN\APPS\1User\Bauman\WORD\PATENTS\Amendments & Responses\LC-465 SUPP AF.doc